



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/087,027

02/28/2002

Adam W. Smith

MS1-861USC1

6939

22801

7590

07/10/2008

LEE & HAYES PLLC

421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500

SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2194

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/087,027	Applicant(s) SMITH ET AL.	
	Examiner Charles E. Anya	Art Unit 2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3/ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/28/07:6/3/08</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-41 are pending in this application.

Specification

2. The cross references related to this application cited in the specification must be updated (i.e. update the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where appropriate, on page 1, lines 2-24 and page 2 lines 1-6). The entire specification should be so revised.

Claim Objections

3. **Claims 19-23 are objected to because of the following informalities:**

It appears claim 19 invokes a 112 6th. provision however, it is not clear from the specification as to what the “means for” represents. It is advisable for Applicant to clearly indicate/claim what the “mean for” represents (i.e. whether is a software/hardware).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. **Claims 5- 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

6. Claims 5 is directed to non-statutory subject matter because the claimed "computer readable medium" is not limited to storage medium. According to Applicant's disclosure, page 32 lines 6-11, the computer readable medium is not limited storage media, instead it is defined to include both storage media (e.g. floppy disk, a hard disk drive, a RAM, CD-ROMSs, DVD-ROMs) and communication media (e.g. signal bearing media, transmission-type media), as such the claim(s) are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

To overcome this rejection the claim(s) need to be amended to include only storage media and not transmission media.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0112078 A1 to Yach in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,792,605 B1 to Roberts et al.**

9. As to claim 1, Yach teaches a software architecture implemented at least in part by a computing device for a distributed computing system comprising: a plurality of applications configured to handle requests submitted by remote devices over a network (“...an information request...” page 1 paragraph 0005,); an application program interface to present functions used by the plurality of applications to access network and computing resources of the distributed computing system (HTTP or information Interface Engine 210 page 4 paragraph 0035); and a common language runtime layer that translates the plurality of applications written in different languages into an intermediate language (“...translation component...” page 1 paragraph 0005, page 2 paragraph 0012, Translation Component 200 page 3 paragraph 0035, page 4 paragraph 0036), the intermediate language being: executed natively by the common runtime layer and configured to access resources or services requested by the remote devices whereby a seamless and robust integration between multi-language application development is allowed (“...common virtual machine language program...” page 1 paragraph 0005, page 2 paragraph 0012, “...standard VM programs...for execution...” page 4 paragraph 0036, “...native VM program....for execution...” page 5 paragraphs 0039-0041).

Yach is silent with reference to providing secure execution environment for multiple programming languages.

Roberts teaches providing secure execution environment for multiple programming languages (“...access control...” Col. 4 Ln. 36 – 38, Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 9, Ln. 47 – 63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yach with the teaching of Roberts because the teaching of Roberts would improve the system of Yach by providing the essential services of *identification and authentication (I&A)*, *authorization*, and *accountability* where identification and authentication determine who can log on to a system, and the association of users with the software subjects that they are able to control as a result of logging in; authorization determines what a subject can do and accountability identifies what a subject (or all subjects associated with a user) did.

10. Claims 1-8,10-16,19-22,24-29,31-34 and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0294500 A1 to Chiang in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,792,605 B1 to Roberts et al.

11. As to claim 1, Chiang teaches a software architecture implemented at least in part by a computing device for a distributed computing system comprising: a plurality of applications configured to handle requests submitted by remote devices over a network (Web Application 400 page 3 paragraphs 0033, "...input files..." page 3 paragraphs 0035/0036, Input 605 page 4 paragraph 0039); an application program interface to present functions used by the plurality of applications to access network and computing resources of the distributed computing system (Application Framework 410 page 3 paragraph 0033); and a common language runtime layer that translates the plurality of applications written in different languages into an intermediate language (Web

Application Source Code Output 610), the intermediate language being: executed natively by the common runtime layer (“The web application generator 205 generates the application framework code 605...regardless of the language format for the input files, because the input tags are interpreted in the same fashion for the different languages...”) and configured to access resources or services requested by the remote devices whereby a seamless and robust integration between multi-language application development is allowed (Web Application Generator 205 page 4 paragraphs 0039 – 0044, page 5 paragraph 0050, page 6 paragraphs 0064, page 7 paragraphs 0068/0069).

Chiang is silent with reference to providing secure execution environment for multiple programming languages.

Roberts teaches providing secure execution environment for multiple programming languages (“...access control...” Col. 4 Ln. 36 – 38, Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 9, Ln. 47 – 63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Chiang with the teaching of Roberts because the teaching of Roberts would improve the system of Chiang by providing the essential services of *identification and authentication (I&A)*, *authorization*, and *accountability* where identification and authentication determine who can log on to a system, and the association of users with the software subjects that they are able to control as a result of logging in; authorization determines what a subject can do and accountability identifies what a subject (or all subjects associated with a user) did.

12. As to claim 2, Chiang teaches the software architecture as recited in claim 1, wherein the distributed computing system comprises client devices and server devices that handle requests from the client devices, the remote devices comprising at least one client device (figures 1/2).

13. As to claim 3, Chiang teaches the software architecture as recited in claim 1, wherein the distributed computing system comprises client devices and server devices that handle requests from the client devices, the remote devices comprising at least one server device that is configured as a Web server (figures 1/2).

14. As to claim 4, Roberts teaches the software architecture as recited in claim 1, wherein the application program interface comprises: a first group of services related to creating Web applications (Col. 7 Ln. 50 – 67, Col. 9 Ln. 27 – 35); a second group of services related to constructing client applications (Col. 14 Ln. 30 – 46); a third group of services related to data and handling XML documents (Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 9, Ln. 59 – 67); and a fourth group of services related to base class libraries (Col. 6 Ln. 7 – 9, Col. 8 Ln. 29 – 38, Ln. 64 – 67).

15. As to claim 5, see the rejection of claims 1 and 4 above.

16. As to claim 6, Roberts teaches the application program interface as recited in claim 5, wherein the first group of services comprises: first functions that enable construction and use of Web services (Col. 9 Ln. 27 – 35); second functions that enable temporary caching of frequently used resources (Col. 11 Ln. 1 – 5); third functions that enable initial configuration (Col. 7 Ln. 11 – 15); fourth functions that enable creation of controls and Web pages (Col. 14 Ln. 30 – 46); fifth functions that enable security in Web server applications (Col. 6 Ln. 7 – 9, Ln. 48 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 50 – 56); sixth functions that enable access to session state values (Col. 6 Ln. 23 – 27).

17. As to claim 7, Roberts teaches the application program interface as recited in claim 5, wherein the second group of services comprises: first functions that enable creation of windowing graphical user interface; and second functions that enable graphical functionality (Col. 14 Ln. 30 – 46).

18. As to claim 8, Roberts teaches the application program interface as recited in claim 5, wherein the third group of services comprises: first functions that enable management of data from multiple data source (Col. 5 Ln. 25 – 43); and second functions that enable XML processing (Col. 5 Ln. 25 – 37, Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 9, Ln. 59 – 67).

19. As to claims 10 and 11, see the rejection of claims 5 and 1 respectively.

Art Unit: 2195

20. As to claim 12, Roberts teaches the distributed computer software architecture as recited in claim 11, further comprising a remote application configured to be executed on one of the remote computing devices, the remote application using the application programming interface to access the networking platform (figure 1 Web Service Engine 101 Col. 4 Ln. 60 – 67, Col. 5 Ln. 1 – 25).

21. As to claims 13-16, see the rejection of claims 4,6 and 7.

22. As to claim 19, Roberts teaches the system comprising: means for exposing a set of functions that enable browser/server communication; means for exposing a second set of functions that enable drawing and construction of client applications (Col. 14 Ln. 30 – 46); means for exposing a third set of functions that enable connectivity to data sources and XML functionality (Col. 5 Ln. 25 – 37, Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 9, Ln. 59 – 67); means for exposing a fourth set of functions that enable system and runtime functionality (Col. 8 Ln. 22 – 28) and providing secure execution environment for multiple programming languages is provided (“...access control...” Col. 4 Ln. 36 – 38, Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 9, Ln. 47 – 63) while Chiang teaches means for translating Web applications written in different languages into an intermediate language, the intermediate language being: executed natively by the common runtime layer (“The web application generator 205 generates the application framework code 605...regardless of the language format for the input files, because the input tags are interpreted in the same fashion for the different languages...”) and configured to access resources or

Art Unit: 2195

services, whereby a seamless and robust integration between multi-language application development is allowed (Web Application Generator 205 page 4 paragraphs 0039 – 0044, page 5 paragraph 0050, page 6 paragraphs 0064, page 7 paragraphs 0068/0069).

23. As to claims 20-22, see the rejection of claims 6-8 respectively.

24. As to claims 24,31 and 36, see the rejection of claim 19 above.

25. As to claim 25, Roberts teaches the computer implemented method as recited in claim 24, further comprising receiving a request from a remote computing device, the request containing a call to at least one of the first, second, third, and fourth functions (Col. 5 Ln. 1 – 25).

26. As to claim 26, see the rejection of claims 20-23 above.

27. As to claims 27-29, see the rejection of claims 6-8 respectively.

28. As to claims 32-34, see the rejection of claims 6-8 above.

29. As to claims 37-39, see the rejection of claim 6-8 respectively.

30. Claims 9,17,18,23,30,35,40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0294500 A1 to Chiang in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,792,605 B1 to Roberts et al. as applied to claim 5, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,517 to Firth et al.

31. As to claim 9, Roberts teaches the application program interface as recited in claim 5, wherein the fourth group of services comprises: first functions that enable definitions of various collections of objects (Col. 8 Ln. 50 – 67); fifth functions that enable input/output of data (Col. 8 Ln. 29 – 38, Ln. 64 – 67); sixth functions that enable a programming interface to network protocol (figure 1 Col. 4 Ln. 60 – 67, Col. 5 Ln. 25 – 37); eleventh functions that enable character encoding (inherent in XML language, since XML language supports character encoding); ninth functions that enable system security and permissions (Col. 6 Ln. 7 – 9); tenth functions that enable installation and running of services (Col. 9 Ln. 27 – 35); and thirteenth functions that facilitate runtime operations (Col. 8 Ln. 22 – 28).

Roberts and Chiang are silent with reference to second functions that enable programmatic access to configuration settings and handling of errors in configuration files; third functions that enable application debugging and code execution tracing; fourth functions that enable customization of data according to cultural related information; seventh functions that enable a managed view of types, methods, and fields; eighth functions that enable culture-specific resources and twelfth functions that enable multi-threaded programming;

Firth teaches second functions that enable programmatic access to configuration settings and handling of errors in configuration files/third functions that enable application debugging and code execution tracing (Col. 13 Ln. 6 – 29); fourth functions that enable customization of data according to cultural related information/eighth functions that enable culture-specific resources (Col. 13 Ln. 6 – 29); seventh functions that enable a managed view of types, methods, and fields; twelfth functions that enable multi-threaded programming (Col. 12 Ln. 52 – 62);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify of system of Roberts and Chiang with the teaching of Firth because the teaching of Firth would improve the system of Roberts and Chiang by creating computer network applications by using a library of reentrant network functions which allow an application to reduce the source code required to interact with a computer network such as the internet (Firth Col. 1 Ln. 9 – 14).

32. As to claims 17,23,30,35,40 see the rejection of claim 9 above.

33. As to claims 18, Chiang teaches a computer system including one or more microprocessors and one or more software programs, that are written in different languages and utilize an application program interface to request services from an operating system through a common language runtime layer (Application Framework 410 page 3 paragraph 0033) and the common language runtime layer that allows multi-language development, with cross language inheritance and translates the one or more

software programs written in different languages into an intermediate language, wherein the intermediate language is executed natively by the common runtime layer (“The web application generator 205 generates the application framework code 605...regardless of the language format for the input files, because the input tags are interpreted in the same fashion for the different languages...”) and is configured to access to the services requested by the one or more software programs (Web Application Generator 205 page 4 paragraphs 0039 – 0044, page 5 paragraph 0050, page 6 paragraphs 0064, page 7 paragraphs 0068/0069).

Roberts teaches the application program interface including separate commands to request services consisting of the following groups of services: A. a first group of services related to creating Web applications, the first group of services comprising: constructing Web services (Col. 9 Ln. 27 – 35); temporary caching resources (Col. 11 Ln. 1 – 5); performing initial configuration (Col. 7 Ln. 11 – 15); creating controls and Web pages (Col. 14 Ln. 30 – 46); enabling security in Web server applications (Col. 6 Ln. 7 – 9, Ln. 48 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 50 – 56); accessing session state values (Col. 6 Ln. 23 – 27); B. a second group of services related to constructing client applications, the second group of services comprising: creating windowing graphical user interface environments/enabling graphical functionality (Col. 14 Ln. 30 Ln. 30 – 46); C. a third group of services related to data and handling XML documents, the third group of services comprising: enabling management of data from multiple data sources (Col. 5 Ln. 25 – 43); second functions that enable XML processing (Col. 5 Ln. 25 – 37, Col. 10 Ln. 1 – 9, Ln. 59 – 67); D. a fourth group of services related to base class libraries, the

Art Unit: 2195

fourth group of services comprising: defining various collections of objects (Col. 8 Ln. 50 – 67); inputting and outputting of data (Col. 8 Ln. 29 – 38, Ln. 64 – 67); enabling a programming interface to network protocols (figure 1 Col. 4 Ln. 60 – 67, Col. 5 Ln. 25 – 37); enabling system security and permissions (Col. 6 Ln. 7 – 9); installing and running services (Col. 9 Ln. 27 – 35); enabling character encoding (inherent in XML language, since XML language supports character encoding); and facilitating runtime operations (Col. 8 Ln. 22 – 28).

Firth teaches customizing data according to cultural related information (Col. 13 Ln 6 – 29); accessing configuration settings and handling errors in configuration files/debugging and tracing code execution (Col. 13 Ln 6 – 29); viewing loaded types, methods, and fields; creating, storing and managing various culture-specific resources (Col. 13 Ln. 6 – 29 and enabling multi-threaded programming (Col. 12 Ln. 52 – 62).

34. As to claim 41, see the rejection of claim 18 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/26/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that (1) the Chiang prior art does not teach or suggest a common language runtime layer that translates the plurality of applications written in different languages into a common language because the multiple markup languages referenced therein are not programming languages, (2) the Chiang prior art

Art Unit: 2195

does not teach or suggest the intermediate language being executed natively by a common runtime layer, (3) the Chiang prior art does not teach or suggest a multi-language application development, and (4) the Chiang prior art does not teach or suggest the use of a particular code module written in a first language with a code module written in a second language.

The Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's arguments:

As to point (1), firstly, it may orderly to define what markup languages are.

Markup languages are **programming languages** designed for the processing, definition and presentation of text. The languages specifies code for formatting, both the layout and style, within a text file. The codes used to specify the formatting are called tags. XML and HTML are examples of widely known and used markup languages.

The Chiang prior art discloses a process for web application development. Web applications are generally prepared by graphic designers/business analysts or web developers. The graphic designers/business analysts create the web application screens (graphical user interface) in one of **several available formats**, such as XML and XSL (Extensible Style Language), HTML, cHTML (compact Hypertext Markup Language) and WML (**i.e. different languages**). These web application screens are then used as input files into a web application server/web application generator. The web application server determines if an application framework code/application source code (intermediate language) is available for the web application, and retrieves the application framework code/application source code from an application directory. If the application framework code/application source code is not available for the web

application, then the web application server via the web application generator generates or translates the input files into the application framework code/application source code, along with a business logic foundation code, an event handler skeleton and a graphical user interface code. The web application generator translates the input files (i.e. applications written in different languages) into or generates **same application framework code/application source code regardless of the language format for the input files**, as such making the application framework code/application source code the intermediate language/code and the web application generator the common language layer (because the application framework code/application source code is the same for the all input files). The web application server via the web application generator/event handler executes/process the application framework code/application source code (i.e. application object) in the native language of the application framework code/application source code which could be either **JavaScript, C#, C++ or SmallTalk**.

As to point (2), as indicate above the application framework code/application source code in the intermediate language (i.e. JavaScript, C#, C++ or SmallTalk) because the web application generator generated or translated the input files (i.e. applications written in different languages) into a language (i.e. JavaScript, C#, C++ or SmallTalk) different from the language of the input files and the same for all input files.

As to point (3), again XML, HTML, XSL and WML are different programming languages translated by the web application generator into a common or intermediate language (i.e. JavaScript, C#, C++ or SmallTalk).

As to point (4), XML, HTML, XSL and WML are different programming languages for use of in a particular code module written in a first language with application framework/application source code (i.e. JavaScript, C#, C++ or SmallTalk) which is a code module written in a second language.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is (571) 272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Meng-Ai An/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2194

